A U M

Wakefulness is the way to immortality; heedlessness is the way to death.
—*The Dhammapada*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLI **September, 1953** **No. 11**

THE PATH TOWARD SELF-RELIANCE

SOMEWHERE, H.P.B. speaks in a somewhat prophetic tone of "the next *terreur,*" indicating, as we recall, that such personages as St. Germain may again be on the scene when the forces combining to produce this future crisis are assembled, and all history shakes as with the ague. We know a little from the annals of the French Revolution of the eighteenth-century reign of terror, but have we reason to think that the terror to come will be like that of the past—or, for that matter, like that of the present?

If we take the gist of H.P.B.'s "Five Messages to the American Theosophists" into account, we may be led to think that the terror of the twentieth century will be quite different. It may be much more psychological than political. Political trimmings are to be expected, of course, but it seems likely that the real source of terror will lie in what promises to be a widespread human inability to make decisions—to choose a position and stand by it.

The epoch of the eighteenth century has various characterizations, but it seems just to say that it was the period of political overthrow of outworn social institutions—of sounding the keynote of political freedom, through the great words of Saint Martin—"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." It is to the point to note that these words, which became the glorious slogan of the French Revolution, were given to the world by a representative of the Theosophical Movement.

What, then, will be the keynote of the closing years of the twentieth century? If the "Five Messages" are any guide, and if numerous *Secret Doctrine* and other statements of H.P.B. are to be relied upon, it

seems clear that the true struggle of the coming cycle will be by individual souls for their psycho-moral independence. The present is undoubtedly a time of the disintegration of authority—every sort of authority. While modern liberals lament the rule of "fear," and the over-riding influence of demagogues who exploit insecurities of the times, the theosophist may say to himself that these tendencies are but symptoms of a larger evolutionary process going on all about us, and in accelerating measure. Since so much of human development is in response to karmic necessity, we may suspect that the forces which now operate to produce these doubts and uncertainties are precisely the forces which are needed to shape the field of choice in the coming cycle —a field on which the reference-points of decision must be identified by individuals for themselves.

Mr. Judge wrote of this aspect of the human situation in the closing issue of the first volume of his *Path* magazine:

> . . . we implicitly believe that in this curve of the cycle, the final authority is *the man himself.* In former times, the disclosed Vedas, and later, the teachings of the great Buddha, were the right authority, in whose authoritative teachings and enjoined practices were found the necessary steps to raise Man to an upright position. But the grand clock of the Universe points to another hour, and now Man must seize the key in his hands and himself—as a whole—open the gate. . . .

But have we not, in Theosophy, the properly "authoritative teachings" for our time? It may be comfortable to think so, yet there is much to suggest that the Founders of the Movement never intended their works to be taken as "authoritative" in this sense. Insofar as any "teaching" becomes the basis for a sense of personal security—or is taken as a substitute for the true self-reliance which both H.P.B. and Judge came to preach—to that extent is the purpose of the Founders frustrated by half-taught disciples. This is another way of saying that the real impartation of Theosophy was an impartation of *principles,* to which were subordinated numerous doctrines, tenets, and illustrations to facilitate the grasp of the principles proposed.

If Mr. Judge's reference to the "grand clock of the Universe" has any point, we may expect that the turn of the cycle will progressively withdraw from view all external sources of security and authority, until human beings are constrained by the bewilderments of the environment about them to think for themselves, to decide for themselves. And if, as a result of the current of self-reliance set going in the world

by the teachers of Theosophy, there are those among Theosophists who have learned to apply principles in decisions, according to their Karma and their plastic potency, then there will at least be present on the scene some practical examples of philosophical balance in a period when the general tendency is likely to be toward agonizing vacillation.

The circumstances of our time all point toward some such crisis. The ancient books speak of the *Kali Yuga* as a period of darkness. They also say that in Kali Yuga there is a "confusion of caste," when the ignoble gain high places and the worthy are cast down. Here, then, almost made to order for our evolutionary need, is the sort of moral environment which demands individual discrimination. When castes are confused, when leaders are not what they seem, no one can assure himself of moral safety—or any other sort of safety—by "joining" the proper party or organization. Kali Yuga is a time of unlabelled identities, of unmarked moral merits and demerits. There will always be a right course of action, but, increasingly, there will be no one to "tell us" which is the right course and which the wrong.

It seems appropriate to note, here, that the United Lodge of Theosophists is not an organization promising salvation to its loyal "followers." The individual who associates himself with the United Lodge of Theosophists acquires no virtue by association. The virtue is rather in his commitment to certain principles and ideals, as set forth in the U.L.T. Declaration. Further, the act of commitment is a strengthening act—it is an act of *giving,* so that the strength gained is self-generated. It is also an act of brotherhood, and here, again, is a source of strength, since brotherhood is one of the higher laws of nature, and anything done in recognition of that law participates in its power.

The fellowship of man in the future will be a fellowship of souls endeavoring to practice self-reliance and self-discovery—a fellowship which honors all those who have enriched the common effort by example of how a man may be self-reliant, yet humble; strong, yet compassionate; sure of his knowledge, yet without any of the vanity which lets the knower overlook the fact that everything he knows he has learned from others who are part of his larger self.

It is perhaps natural that growth in self-reliance contains endless lessons in the practice of brotherhood. The self-reliant individual tends to reject second-hand judgments of other people, movements, or ideas. He resists party condemnations and blanket charges. He feels that

there is something wrong with them—as, indeed, there always is. The acceptance of any sort of "line" seems to him deceptively easy, as though this sort of opinion involves taking something for nothing—in this case, an opinion—without the ardor of individual investigation and evaluation. And the self-reliant man cannot take something for nothing. It would violate his inner nature.

Something like this applies in the study of Theosophy. Finding a puzzling statement by H.P.B., the self-reliant student pays his greatest tribute to the teacher by insisting that he understand it; not, to be sure, by demanding that others "make" him see—a procedure which is ridiculous—but by pondering the question until finally the issues involved become clear.

What other explanation can there be of what Mr. Judge terms "the tone of settled conviction" which pervades his book, *The Ocean of Theosophy?* There is a weakness of the psychic nature which reacts with humiliation and resentment whenever an inquirer questions some statement, attitude, or judgment which the student has allowed himself to take for granted. Yet such questions are really blessings in disguise, if they are able to betray to view this kind of evidence of a sectarian spirit—which is simply a species of the "party" type of belief. It is like saying, somewhat indignantly, "Do you *dare* question the Teacher?"

But the Teacher has always been willing to be questioned. Rather it is the student's weakness that is expressed by this emotional reaction; we are not called upon to challenge a questioner's lack of faith, but might well probe the psychological foundations of our own.

There are always "unreasonable" questions, but there are also unreasonable responses to questions. And it will be natural that, in a cycle of this sort, every sort of question will be directed at Theosophy and Theosophists. The great objective, in all such cases, is to exhibit the fact that Theosophy, above all other approaches to the meaning of life, proposes that human beings have in them the capacity for self-knowledge. This is the one faith Theosophy seeks to inspire, for only as this faith grows will there be the spread of an attitude of mind which leads to serious study.

We have a "teaching" of the fact of Self-knowledge, and this we may repeat. What is more difficult is to practice the attitude which grows out of the intellectual conviction that self-knowledge is a possibility for every man.

THE CURE OF DISEASES

MORTAL ills and the needs of the stomach rank next after the instinct of self-preservation among all the subjects which engage the attention of the race. If we do not go on living, we cannot do the work we think there is to do; if we remain hungry, we will lose the power to work properly or to enjoy, and at last come to the door of death. From bad or scanty food follows a train of physical ills called generally disease. Disease reaches us also through too much food. So in every direction these ills attack us; even when our feeding is correct and sufficient it is found that we fall a prey because our Karma, settled by ourselves in some previous life, ordains that we enter on this one handicapped by the hereditary taint due to the wickedness or the errors of our fathers and mothers. And the records of science show that the taint in the blood or the lymph may jump over many lives, attacking with virulence some generation distant very far from the source. What wonder, then, that the cure of disease is an all-absorbing subject with every one! The Christian knows that it is decreed by Almighty God that He will visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, even to the third and fourth generation, and the non-believer sees that by some power in nature the penalty is felt even so far.

All of this has given to the schools of mental and so-called "metaphysical" healing a strong pull on the fears, the feelings, the wishes, and the bodies of those to whom they address themselves, and especially in the United States. That there is more attention given to the subject in America seems true to those who have been on the other side of the Atlantic and noticed how small is the proportion of people there who know anything about the subject. But in the United States in every town many can be found who know about these schools and practise after their methods. Why it has more hold here can be left to conjecture, as the point under consideration is why it has any hold at all. It is something like patent medicine. Offer a cure to people for their many ills, and they will take it up; offer it cheap, and they will use it; offer it as an easy method, and they will rush for it under certain conditions. Metaphysical healing is easy for some because it declares, first, that no money need be paid to doctors for medicine; second, that medical

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed by Wm. Q. Judge in the *Path* for September, 1892, and also appeared in THEOSOPHY 3; 493.

fluids and drugs may be dispensed with; and third, that it is easily learned and practised. The difficulties that arise out of the necessities of logic are not present for those who never studied it, but are somewhat potent with those who reason correctly;—but that is not usual for the general run of minds. They see certain effects and accept the assumed cause as the right one. But many persons will not even investigate the system, because they think it requires them to postulate the non-existence of that which they see before their eyes. The statements quoted from the monthly *Christian Science* in March *Path*[1] are bars in the way of such minds. If they could be induced to just try the method offered for cure, belief might result, for effects indeed often follow. But the popular mind is not in favor of "mind cure," and more prominence is given in the daily papers to cases of death under it than to cures. And very full reports always appear of a case such as one in March, where "faith curers," in order to restore life, went to praying over the dead body of one of the members of a believing family.

During a recent tour over this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific and back, I had the opportunity of meeting hundreds of disciples of these schools, and found in nearly all cases that they were not addicted to logic but calmly ignored very plain propositions, satisfied that if cures were accomplished the cause claimed must be the right one, and almost without exception they denied the existence of evil or pain or suffering. There was a concurrence of testimony from all to show that the dominant idea in their minds was the cure of their bodily ills and the continuance of health. The accent was not on the beauty of holiness or the value to them and the community of a right moral system and right life, but on the cure of their diseases. So the conclusion has been forced home that all these schools exist because people desire to be well more than they desire to be good, although they do not object to goodness if that shall bring wholeness.

And, indeed, one does not have to be good to gain the benefit of the teachings. It is enough to have confidence, to assert boldly that this does not exist and that that has no power to hurt one. I do not say the teachers of the "science" agree with me herein, but only that whether you are good or bad the results will follow the firm practice of the method enjoined, irrespective of the ideas of the teachers.

---

[1]See "Affirmations and Denials," reprinted in THEOSOPHY for April, 1914.

For in pure mind-cure as compared with its congener "Christian Science," you do not have to believe in Jesus and the gospels, yet the same results are claimed, for Jesus taught that whatever you prayed for with faith, that you should have.

Scientific research discloses that the bodies of our race are infected with taints that cause nearly all of our diseases, and school after school of medicine has tried and still tries to find the remedy that will dislodge the foulness in the blood. This is scientific, since it seeks the real physical cause; metaphysical healing says it cures, but cannot prove that the cause is destroyed and not merely palliated. That there is some room for doubt history shows us, for none will deny that many a pure thinking and acting pair have brought forth children who displayed some taint derived from a distant ancestor. Evidently the pure individual thoughts had no power over the great universal development of the matter used by those human bodies.

Turning now to medicine, we find the Italian Count Mattei promulgating a system of cure by the homeopathic use of subtle vegetable essences which may well give pause to those who would make universal the curing by faith or mind alone. Some of his liquids will instantly stop violent pain, restore sight, give back hearing, and dissipate abnormal growths. His globules will make a drunken man sober, and, given to the nurse who suckles a babe, will cure the child who takes the milk. The drunkard and the child do not think about or have faith in the remedies, yet they cure. Is it not better to restore health by physical means and leave the high teachings of the healers, all taken from well known sources, for the benefit of our moral nature?

And if Christian healers read these lines, should they not remember that when the prophet restored the widow's son he used physical means —his own magnetism applied simultaneously to every member of the child's body, and Jesus, when the woman who touched his garment was cured, lost a portion of his vitality—not his thoughts—for he said "virtue" had gone out from him? The Apostle also gave directions that if any were sick the others should assemble about the bed and anoint with oil, laying on their hands meanwhile: simply physical therapeutics following a long line of ancient precedent dating back to Noah. Moses taught how to cure diseases and to disinfect places where contagion lurked. It was not by using the high power of thought, but by processes deemed by him to be effectual, such as sprinkling blood of animals

slaughtered in peculiar circumstances. Without declaring for or against his methods, it is very certain that he supposed by these means subtle forces of a physical nature would be liberated and brought to bear on the case in hand.

The mass of testimony through the ages is against healing physical ills by the use of the higher forces in nature, and the reason, once well known but later on forgotten, is the one given in the article of January, 1892,[2]—that diseases are gross manifestations showing themselves on their way out of the nature so that one may be purified. To arrest them through thought ignorantly directed is to throw them back into their cause *and replant them in their mental plane.*

This is the true ground of our objection to metaphysical healing practices, which we distinguish from the assumptions and so-called philosophy on which those methods are claimed to stand. For we distinctly urge that the effects are not brought about by any philosophical system whatever, but by the practical though ignorant use of psycho-physiological processes.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

Our position about the cure of bodily ailments is that inasmuch as they are of and in the body, those that come from a wrong attitude of mind will disappear when we are contented and self-centered, while those that are chronic, being mechanical and physical, ought to be treated by such means and not by an attempt to drag the spiritual and divine down to this plane of being. In none of the ancient schools was it permitted to one to use for himself, or to sell, the divine or spiritual powers.

Health may be maintained by attention to the ordinary laws of nature on the material plane by attending to hygiene and exercise. Yet again, looking at the prize-fighter and the athlete, it is plain that they, by attending to the same rules, and wholly disregarding the fine theories of the mental healers, become well and strong and able to bear the greatest fatigue and hardship. It was the same in the days of the athletes of Rome and Greece.

—W. Q. JUDGE

[2]See "Of Metaphysical Healing," reprinted in THEOSOPHY for April, 1914.

WORD PUZZLES

OF the terms expressing religious ideas, more than half, it seems, have acquired "double" or contradictory definitions. This is most easily illustrated by the word religion itself, which connotes both "to bind together," as in a brotherhood, and to "bind fast"—to force, or hold by compulsion.

Even the words meant to be employed only in the description of doctrinal abstractions often lead the mind in opposite directions. Take, for instance, "Absolute." The metaphysical definition of "absolute reality," as contained in Webster's, we note, indicates why H.P.B. uses the term so frequently in suggesting what is meant by the first fundamental proposition of *The Secret Doctrine.* Webster says this of "absolute reality":

> Ultimate reality as it is in itself, sometimes conceived as unknowable, as by Kant and Herbert Spencer, sometimes as containing nothing which cannot be known, as by Hegel, but always as unaffected by the perception or knowledge of any finite being.

The Latin root of Absolute is that from which "absolve" also comes, and is meant to indicate that which is freed or disengaged from any particular involvement. This meaning is carried by the usage of absolute in the field of grammar, in the discipline of logic, in the science of physics and in the contemplation of philosophy—but we also discover that synonyms for absolute are given as "arbitrary, peremptory, categorical, downright and unconditional." Now, how did a word originally meant to suggest "beyond the range and reach of human thought" come so often to stand for the rigid categories of doctrinal assertion? It has been the religionists presumably concerned with speaking to the "Absolute Mind" who have insisted upon the acceptance of predetermined conclusions in all speculative fields. Yet, it is *free* thought, actually, which is "absolute," and those who truly know what "free thought" is never claim possession of ultimate knowledge.

Thus, H.P.B., while using "Absolute" in its pure sense, is careful to make clear that there is no such thing as absolute truth, so far as the human mind is concerned. Her article "What Is Truth?" begins with the question put by Pontius Pilate to Jesus, and H.P.B. points out the

significance of Christ's disinclination to answer. "The truth which he did not divulge," she writes, moreover, "remained unrevealed, for his later followers as much as for the Roman Governor."

> The silence of Jesus, however, on this and other occasions, does not prevent his present followers from acting as though they had received the ultimate and absolute Truth itself; and from ignoring the fact that only such Words of Wisdom had been given to them as contained a share of the truth, itself concealed in parables and dark, though beautiful, sayings.
>
> This policy led gradually to dogmatism and assertion. Dogmatism in churches, dogmatism in science, dogmatism everywhere. The possible truths, hazily perceived in the world of abstraction, like those inferred from observation and experiment in the world of matter, are forced upon the profane multitudes, too busy to think for themselves, under the form of *Divine revelation* and *Scientific authority.* But the same question stands open from the days of Socrates and Pilate down to our own age of wholesale negation: is there such a thing as *absolute truth* in the hands of any one party or man? Reason answers, "there cannot be." There is no room for absolute truth upon any subject whatsoever, in a world as finite and conditioned as man is himself.

Turning again to Joseph Shipley's *Dictionary of Word Origins,* quoted last month in the first article of this series, we see another emergence of dual meaning for "absolute." Shipley explains:

> If you are *absolved* you are set free (from sin and guilt, in church use), from L. *absolvere, absolut—,* from *ab,* from, + *solvere, solut—,* to loosen. But if you are loose, free from ties, you are acting wholly by yourself; hence the sense of *absolute* monarchy and the like. The *solution* of a problem is that which loosens it—especially if it be a knotty one; then of course you have *solved* it. Chemical *solution* is aphetic for *dissolution,* a loosening apart (L. *dis,* away, apart); the verb still retains the full form, *dissolve.*

Do we see how many intriguing issues are here involved? There are, quite evidently, two kinds of freedom for man, and, as has so often been pointed out, these may be described as "license," or freedom from all restraint, and that higher freedom which means full maturity and self-reliance. When "acting wholly by yourself," you are a despot. This is no genuine form of self-reliance, but simply a vainglorious declaration that you are not accountable to anyone for motives and actions.

The Church doctrine of absolution was the poorest of substitutes for the necessary *absolution from authority* which must be attempted by the

self-governed sage. The Church proposed to extract from a man, and for a price, his sense of wrong-doing. But if it be recognized that at the heart of the sense of wrong-doing is the "still small voice of spiritual consciousness"—the conscience—man absolved by the Church is man emasculated. The *dissolution* of guilt can only take place by internal absolution, never by a pouring on of water from above. Man must not be prevented from wrestling with awareness of his own trust as a moral agent. Thus, *dissolution* becomes a much more appropriate term for describing what the Church called *absolution.* And Man's conscience, watered by tepid theological showers which dilute his sense of individual wrong-doing, gradually softens and loses its natural resilience.

Turning from scholarly considerations to the world of affairs, we find that in political history the polar opposites of temperament and proclivity are described as "anarchistic" and "totalitarian." What truth is the anarchist seeking to represent? This depends, of course, upon what sort of anarchist is meant. To some degree, however, anarchism has correctly represented itself as an idealistic philosophy, and devotees who so conceive it have claimed there is an ultimate moral necessity in learning to live beyond externally imposed restraints. However distorted an anarchist's methods and doctrines may have been, the fact remains that the anarchists have sometimes glimpsed a partial vision of man's *absolute* nature—that he needs no commandments, no doctrines, no coercion to encourage growth into his full stature. The strength and the glory of the anarchist is that whatever else he may become, no matter how many subversions of government and authority he may plan or carry out, he is at least not an oppressive moralist. He does not condemn his fellow human beings, but only certain patterns of action—mostly the stereotyped ones—which, he claims, keep people from being fully themselves.

The totalitarian, on the other hand, whether political or religious, is the living embodiment of moralizing and condemnatory tendencies; *i.e.,* people *should* see this, do that, believe in *this* and no other truth. Therefore, for "their" own good, conformity will be sought through any means likely to prove effective. There are many more devotees of totalitarian psychology among us than we are likely to realize. For instance, the modern advertising executive, whether he knows it or not, often turns "absolutist" in this sense. That is, he applies a formula designed to activate the emotional and mental impulses of men in a

predetermined direction. Men who have become accustomed to the essentially conscienceless life of arbitrary religious commandments are thus easily bilked by advertising propaganda. It is not hard, in other words, to become "bound fast" to the habit of thinking and responding in patterns.

H.P.B.'s provocative remarks about the final struggle which may be expected to take place between the principles of Theosophy and the principles of Jesuitism have obvious pertinence, here. Is it not possible that this is an equivalent of saying that, with the coming to the human race of more complete moral responsibility, all will have to choose between the two definitions of "absolute" here briefly discussed, after understanding all the concomitants and associations these oppositely oriented meanings invoke?

Since H. P. Blavatsky uses both "absolute" and the word *abstract* in development of her first fundamental proposition of Theosophy, we might also give some attention to this latter term. In the first place, "abstract," like "absolute," has acquired a few derogatory connotations, especially in colloquial usage. To *abstract* means "to draw away from"—the opposite of "drawing toward," but does not mean that whenever thought moves into abstract realms, it escapes from reality. To "draw away" from the physical may also mean drawing closer to a realm of perceptions which gives increased meaning to physical experience.

Our most valuable and self-correcting insights come from acquiring new perspectives, and new perspectives come only when we relinquish older frames of reference. We are, for instance, forever involved in "motion"—the motion of that principle of desire signified in Sanskrit by "kama-manas." The perception of abstract motion, on the other hand, is an awareness that the *whole* of existence is a vast "turba" *from* the standpoint of matter, while from another perspective motion represents necessary ingredients of universal striving. The first thing to be learned from a study of genuine psychology, Eastern or Western, then, is that all men are the same in kind, differing only to the degree they are aware of and able to control their own "turbulence."

We are thus members of a universal brotherhood in two ways: first, we share *chaotic* motion with all animate life; but, second, as mind beings, we also share a capacity for inducing centripetal motion. The latter capacity, when fully developed, becomes the stability of the sage.

ON INHIBITIONS

AS the years pass, the clearing of an ever enlarging common meeting ground between Theosophical concepts and the best in modern psychological thought seems inevitable. Uniquely, in the past, Theosophical teachings dealt with Eastern philosophy—a philosophy of symbolism, while psychologists have been rather exclusively concerned with the development of Western science. And, indeed, it is the great symbolical ideas which lead the soul of man to ever-deepening perceptions of the essential nature of things. Often, now, though, psychologists show interest in philosophical symbolism, and sometimes provide synthesizing concepts which make it easier for philosophy and science to unite.

The term "inhibition" is, in the popular mind, one of the most familiar—and frequently rather misunderstood—words in psychology. "Inhibitions" have often been regarded as those feelings which prevent an individual, through fear, from doing or saying things which would be considered unacceptable in "civilized" society. Dr. Karen Horney offers a definition which is yet more precise. She defines inhibitions as the "inability to do, feel or think certain things, and its function is to avoid the anxiety which would arise if the person attempted to do, feel or think those things." Inhibitions, thus defined, are a form of ignorance or soul-immaturity. We are narrow-minded and insular, not because of any specific knowledge we lack, but primarily because there are countless alternatives in the resolving of problems to which we fail to give consideration.

We seldom act as soul- and mind-beings—beings of choice. We merely re-act, and these reactions are but unassimilated carry-overs from our contacts with prior situations. Many times, if we stop to think about it, we feel we have "no choice." Yet if we employed our imagination and considered some apparently "impossible" alternatives, we would be surprised to find ourselves possessed of new perspectives and possibilities.

There are times, certainly, when all the potential resolutions of a problem that one can conceive, including that of just waiting for it to "solve itself," do seem inadequate, perhaps because the results of such actions upon others would clearly be injurious. But perhaps such a

dilemma is but a karmic result of having previously closed off the mind and imagination in other less tightly woven situations. Major crises do not arise frequently in one lifetime, as has so frequently been pointed out. Perhaps knowledge of the highest nature consists, not so much in the possession of particular information and faculties, valuable as these may be, but in the ability to see endless possibilities or alternatives of decision. Cultivation of such a power would certainly increase one's capacity to judge equitably and to act with long-range understanding; and could lead naturally, too, toward universal compassion. Thus the "truly" uninhibited man.

On the other hand, in the economy of nature, inhibitions must have a function. It may be that a man instinctively shuts himself off from ideas or courses of action which he not only feels, but *is* incapable of handling adequately at present. This is the case of the child for whom knowledge far beyond his understanding has, unless artificially stimulated, no interest or attraction. But what of the experiences we also shut out which could come naturally as part of our lives, which Karma brings naturally close to us?

It may be true that a man is as incapable as he feels, but the more possibilities he is able to imagine, the less bound by the consequences is he, because the more conscious his choices. Even the inevitable consequences of the course finally decided upon are then seen to be "chosen"—to be met, worked with and made in turn causes of better results. The "uninhibited" man sees and acts always with a purpose; results but follow. Seeing this, he can then face such results without fear. Taking this position, he will find more ways to salvage good from failure, and also be more ready to build wisely upon success. The discovery that one has this power, the greatest power of the free soul, can be made by each looking earnestly within himself. But it is not enough merely to agree that it is so; he must *realize* it. All other places it may be found, in writings and sayings, are mere reflections and reminders to the man of that which is within. And of this it can truly be said, "Even a little of this knowledge delivers a man from great risk."

The "inability to do, feel or think certain things" bears a direct relation to the practice of brotherhood. For by developing an attachment, either by attraction or by repulsion, for certain acts, thoughts, or feelings, one becomes unable to consider them dispassionately. The more possibilities one can admit, the better able he is to identify himself *at*

will with any other being, rather than with any act, thought or feeling, and the less likely to attach himself to any *one* course of action and its results. Only when he can identify himself thus with every being in the universe is he fully Self-conscious. He becomes the center which is everywhere, the circumference nowhere.

Brotherhood cannot be practiced from theory. A man may genuinely admire humility as an ideal, but unless he feels a sympathetic respect for that in all men which is also common to himself, he cannot be genuinely humble, and is furthermore in danger of becoming a hypocrite. Until he can find something in others identical with himself, these others remain separate from him. The great teachings say that that which is common to all is the great Self of All, from which arises the desire and the power of growth, however varied its manifestations. But we also live in a world of appearance and effect. Unless a man is willing to discipline himself to see ever-widening possibilities, how is he to discover this principle of growth—the manifestation of the One Self—in all the myriad forms of life which surround him? To be truly "brother" to all beings, one must be able to see something of value in every idea which might make its appeal to other men, even though one might personally discard it in favor of a greater truth.

It is in our associations with others that we may provide ourselves with a natural means of transcending "inhibitions" and developing a cosmopolitan attitude. By learning to understand, even a little, the points of view of those who surround us, we become less fearful of them—and of life generally. Yet we have a tendency, nationally as well as individually, to view a breakdown in our relations with others as a basic, generalized difference between "them" and "us." This in itself indicates a failure to consider "many alternatives"—a failure to transcend inhibitions of the soul. Perhaps we are loath to admit even partial justification for what we consider an unreasonable action, because such an admission would imply that the other was partly "right" and ourselves partly wrong. Thus we are caught in the act of misrepresenting ourselves. The most unpleasant aspect of such an admission, even to oneself, is the realization that we brushed aside, without honest consideration, alternatives of viewpoint.

If, then, the elimination of inhibition is of great importance, we should not become preoccupied with the attainment of any *particular* virtues. For the virtue of a good man lies not in what he has done, the

effects of which are already determined, but in his ever-willingness to discover how something better may be evolved out of what has already been done. This implies, too, not only the intellectual "seeing" of alternatives, but the willingness to follow an intuition to a point where its justification can be seen or disproved—for it is by this means that we often learn new truths.

Surely, then, a whole universe lies concealed beneath our eyes, waiting to be discovered in the relationships we daily renew. And in our willingness to constantly pursue the search for "new alternatives" lies the key to the utopias and visions of brotherhood men have always dreamed, and of the idealism which buds, albeit sometimes misshapen, in the heart and mind of every youth.

DEVOTION TO VISHNU

The disciple must learn to do every act with the Divine in view, and the Divine in everything. As it is said in the *Brihad Nundèkèshwar Purana:* "While taking medicine one should think of Vishnu or the all-pervading; while eating, of Janârdana, the All-Giver; while lying down, of Padmanabha; while marrying, of Prajapati, the Lord of Creatures; while fighting, of Chakradhara; while traveling in a foreign land, of Trivikrama; at the time of death, of Narayana; at the time of reunion with friends, of Sridhara; after dreaming bad dreams, of Govinda; at the time of danger, of Madhusudana; in the midst of a forest, of Narsingha; in the midst of fire, of Jalasai, or the one lying on the water; in the midst of water, of Varaha; on the mountain, of Raghunandana; while going, of Vaurana; and in all acts, of Madhava." All these names are the names of Vishnu in his various powers and appearances. It is seeing Krishna in everything, and everything in him. This at last we must do, for Ishwara, the spirit in each of us, is none other than Krishna; therefore let us think of Him and fight; while entangled in this dense forest of existence, let us think of Him, the Lion our guard, the Sage our guide, the Warrior our sure defense and shield.

—*Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*

DIMENSIONS OF FREE INQUIRY

Christianity and Authority

FROM its very inception in this era, the Theosophical Movement has fostered and encouraged the spirit and practice of free inquiry. This policy and platform were openly declared when the original Theosophical Society was founded in 1875, as is clearly attested by the Three Objects for the pursuit of which the Society was established. This was but a reaffirmation of the policy and method of Masters all down the ages; and such free inquiry follows from the nature of human evolution itself. Once the *Thinker* appears on the scene, his further evolution is by self-induced and self-devised efforts. He cannot shirk the responsibility attaching to the possession of mind; and one of the most important aspects of that responsibility is to use his mind in the study and investigation of both himself and Nature. This is the inherent right and obligation of every man. The perpetuation of the Theosophical Movement in the world-at-large along the lines laid down by its Great Founders, the Masters, hinges very largely, if not entirely, upon the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and investigation. Once such right is discountenanced, and such practice penalized, then it means that an authority has been set up, dogmatic ideas promulgated, and a priesthood of one kind or another enthroned. Theosophy, or rather what is thought to be Theosophy, will then have degenerated into another creed, and the spirit of eternal truth will have left it.

In the *Key to Theosophy* (p. 305) H.P.B. warned against just such a contingency in the following words:

> Every such attempt as the Theosophical Society has hitherto ended in failure, because, sooner or later, it has degenerated into a sect, set up hard-and-fast dogmas of its own, and so lost by imperceptible degrees that vitality which living truth alone can impart. You must remember that all our members have been bred and born in some creed or religion, that all are more or less of their generation both physically and mentally, and consequently that their judgment is but too likely to be warped and unconsciously biassed by some or all of these influences. If, then, they cannot be freed from such inherent bias, or at least taught to recognize it instantly and so avoid being led away by it, the result can only be that the Society will drift off on to some sandbank of thought or another, and there remain a stranded carcass to moulder and die.

That freedom of inquiry was the animating spirit of the WISDOM-RELIGION all down the ages can easily be proved by referring to a few outstanding historical examples, although the historical records of the Secret Doctrine cover ages extending into the very night of time, ages now considered as prehistoric and archaic.

Take, for instance, the year 500 A.D. That date represents approximately the dividing point between two significant millenniums: the millennium which divided the pre-Christian and the post-Christian periods by the year One of the Nativity; and the millennium extending from about the year 500 A.D. to the year 1500, and known to history as the dark age, the thousand-year "night" of the Middle Ages. The first of these millenniums is referred to in the Introductory to *The Secret Doctrine* as the period "beginning with Buddha and Pythagoras at the one end and the Neo-Platonists and Gnostics at the other," and spoken of as "the only focus left in History wherein converge for the last time the bright rays of light streaming from the aeons of time gone by, unobscured by the hand of bigotry and fanaticism." The second millennium, from 500 A.D. on, was inaugurated by the deliberate determination of the church to quench the light of the eternal philosophic quest which the Gnostics and Neo-Platonists sought to keep burning. It was about the year 500 A.D., too, at the Council of Constantinople, that the Church hurled an anathema at the teaching of reincarnation—the doctrine which implied that all of life is a *self*-revelation, a self-rewarding and -punishing process—so it is fitting that the banishment of this idea should have ushered in the Age of Fear of Authority. After this event, there descended upon Europe a pall of spiritual darkness, and wherever else the power of the Church held sway.

As the first instance of the truth that free inquiry was inculcated by all the Great Sages, let us examine the mission and the teachings of the one whom the Christian world regards as the Founder of their "religions"—Jesus. We have used the term "religions" advisedly, as, on the face of it, the plural indicates the absurdity of the three main churches, the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, and the Protestant, and the several hundred sects of the latter—all claiming to have *the* truth, and that theirs is the only road to salvation. Regarding the year One of the Nativity, that there appeared a Great Being at about that date, and that he presented once again some of the immemorial truths of Theosophy, is attested by the records of the Adept Custodians of

that Divine Knowledge; and also by the records contained in the New Testament of the Bible, however imperfect, fragmentary and perverted these Biblical records must be. In spite of the desperate attempts of religious partisans to tamper with the story and teachings, they have not been able to efface some of the tell-tale signs of the true mission and teachings of Jesus. Innumerable proofs that Jesus was a champion of free inquiry and the divine right of the spirit of every man may be drawn from his own sayings in the New Testament; surely no one can object to this source.

Jesus protested the presumption and authority of the priestly power in Judea. His was essentially a great reform movement. This priesthood in Palestine, like the sacerdotal powers in all countries and in all ages, ran true to form; it ruled with an iron hand, brooked no opposition to its self-assumed authority, and visited dire punishment and ostracism upon all who dared to question its dogmatic interpretations of the *Torah* or Mosaic law. Jesus was an incarnate protest against this authority. That he upheld and defended the dignity of the free mind and soul of man is clearly seen by many of his utterances. In Matt.7:7, Jesus taught:

> Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you:
> For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

Is there any assertion of external authority in these verses? Do not "seeking," "asking" and "knocking" imply the inherent power resident in man's own mind and spirit to know every truth? It brings to mind a similar direction of Krishna to his pupil Arjuna in the Fourth Chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gita:*

> Seek this wisdom by doing service, *by strong search, by questions, and by humility.*

True asking and seeking, of course, is not just mental investigation; it is asking and seeking with the divine Soul, which is verily the Man Himself. It is spiritual aspiration which includes the welfare of all other souls which is the *sine qua non* for the reception and impartation of the highest wisdom. A further comment in *Light on the Path* on the New Testament verse states:

> "Ask and ye shall have" sounds like something too easy and simple to be credible. But the disciple cannot "ask" in the mystic sense

in which the word is used in this scripture until he has attained the power of helping others. . . . The divine give, they demand that you also shall give before you can be of their kin.

The subjoined Precepts from *The Voice of the Silence* further sum up the spirit of right inquiry, and the unlimited vistas of knowledge that open up when one so reads the Book of Nature:

> Help Nature and work on with her; and Nature will regard thee as one of her creators and make obeisance.
>
> And she will open wide before thee the portals of her secret chambers, lay bare before thy gaze the treasures hidden in the very depths of her pure virgin bosom. Unsullied by the hand of Matter, she shows her treasures only to the eye of Spirit—the eye which never closes, the eye for which there is no veil in all her kingdoms.
>
> Then will she show thee the means and way, the first gate and the second, the third, up to the very seventh. And then, the goal; beyond which lie, bathed in the sunlight of the Spirit, glories untold, unseen by any save the eye of Soul.

The Second and Third Objects of the Parent Theosophical Society call for study and investigation; but for these to become effective and lead to the desired results, *viz.,* the discovery of the One Truth underlying all religions, philosophies and sciences, and a spiritual understanding of the hidden laws of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man, they must be pursued in the light of the First Object—Universal Brotherhood without distinctions of any kind, and with minds open to knowledge of the soul. If pursued in any lesser spirit, even the most rigorous studies and investigations may lead to confusions of "duties and responsibilities" in regard to the rest of nature. Often the difference is as sharply defined as is day and night, light and darkness, a distinction established at the very end of *The Ocean of Theosophy* in regard to hypnotism:

> Improper is the manner of the scientific schools which without a thought for the true nature of man indulge in experiments in hypnotism in which the subjects are injured for life, put into disgraceful attitudes, and made to do things for the satisfaction of the investigators which would never be done by men and women in their normal state. The Lodge of the Masters does not care for Science unless it aims to better man's state morally as well as physically, and no aid will be given to Science until she looks at man and life from the moral and spiritual side. For this reason those who know all about the

> psychical world, its denizens and laws, are proceeding with a reform in morals and philosophy before any great attention will be accorded to the strange and seductive phenomena possible for the inner powers of man.

Among the amoral investigations carried on by scientists, particularly in the field of medicine, is the vivisection of animals. Even though with the idea of doing good to humans, thousands of animals are daily cut up while alive, and made to suffer untold tortures, so that the vivisectionists may see what is going on in the bodies of these poor, dumb and helpless creatures. Is it not just as great a violation of the law of brotherhood to vivisect an animal as it is to vivisect a man? Are not both souls, the difference being only in the degree of evolutionary unfoldment? Hypnotic experimentations also indulge in a type of vivisection, and in some respects this is even worse than the cutting up of the living corpus, for hypnotic vivisection invades man's psychic nature. H.P.B.'s pointed words in her article, "Black Magic in Science," are:

> We have accused science of gliding full sail down the Maelstrom of Black Magic, by practising that which ancient Psychology—the most important branch of the Occult Sciences—has always declared as Sorcery in its application to the *inner man.* We are prepared to maintain what we say, . . . basing ourselves on facts published and the actions produced by the Hypnotism of Vivisectionists themselves. That they are unconscious sorcerers does not make away with the fact that they do practise the Black Art *bel et bien.*

The difference in method and motive between such processes of investigation and the occult has become painfully acute in recent years, due to the discovery and practical application of atomic power. Those who may have been inclined previously to regard this as a purely academic problem, can no longer do so in face of the sword of Damocles suspended over the head of all humanity. The great danger has produced an awakening among many scientists and in every direction. But the danger will only be definitely averted by the adoption by science as a whole, and the world generally, of those conditions attached to "the spirit of free inquiry"—taught by the Elder Brothers of the race—inquiry with a realization at all times of the responsibility incurred in the possession and transmission of knowledge.

NATURE UNAIDED FAILS

IN outlining the occult tenet of the origin of mind in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* Mr. Judge states that mind was *given* to the mindless monads by the Sons of Wisdom, who are the Elder Brothers of every family of men on any globe. The use of the term "given" has puzzled some students, since under Karma and the doctrine of evolution nothing can be conferred as a gift, but all, it is implied, must be earned through individual effort and merit. Yet, there are two *Secret Doctrine* ideas which easily enlighten this gift of mind by the Elder Brothers.

The fundamental fact of evolution, say Theosophical Teachers, is that the process begins on top, or in Spirit. This is, of course, the exact opposite of the generally prevailing scientific theory that evolution begins in the depths of matter, but it suggests that no mind is entirely an emergence. The second tenet, which is really a corollary of the law that evolution begins in Spirit, is embodied in the occult maxim, "Nature Unaided Fails."

Not only does evolution begin in Spirit in Theosophy, but Spirit *remains* the impelling force *at all times* and at every point in the cyclic movement of progress in the Kingdoms of Nature. If the impelling power seems at times to come from the direction of matter, this is due to the limitation of man's perceptive faculties, presently incapable of seeing more than a relatively minute segment of the vast cyclic sphere of the evolutionary process. The course of evolution for "every purely spiritual Buddhi or divine Soul through the Cycle of Incarnation or 'Necessity' during the whole term" of manifestation is, broadly considered, divided into two grand stages. In the first stage, the Monads pass through every elemental form of the phenomenal world, through mineral, plant, and animal phases. The apex of this stage of monadic evolution is the production of animal man—the man physical but not mental. The form taken, it is said, is derived from a prototype—a class of "creators" called the Lunar Pitris, who are, truly, ourselves *as astral* beings. In this initial stage of the evolutionary process we may regard the spiritual impulsion as proceeding from "without within," *i.e.,* Spirit or Self-consciousness could not yet incarnate *as such* in the forms of the lower kingdoms; it could only affect and impel them forward

from within as an overshadowing Presence, from without or outside the forms.

It is only at the second stage of the evolutionary process, then, that Spirit or Self-consciousness *can* function *as such* from *within* the form. We now say that further progress is from "within without." This view is that represented by Mr. Judge's explanation of the story of the building of Solomon's Temple as given in the *Ocean.* The temple refers to man whose frame is silently built up, finished and decorated. "Man could not have his bodily temple to live in until all the matter in and about his world had been found by the Master, who is the inner man; when found the plans for working it required to be detailed." During this long preparatory period, the Master—Man—was hidden from sight within, carrying forward the plans for the foundations of the human temple. When this bodily temple was finally erected, the Master—Man—was able to *move in* and use it from within for its best and highest purposes.

With the production of the man in form—the astral body—the initial spiritual impulsion imparted to Matter reaches the limit of its potentiality. Now, lest evolution come to a halt, and the aim of the Soul be frustrated, a second spiritual impulse must be imparted, and the appearance on the scene of the human astral form makes this possible. *The Secret Doctrine* declares that "the monad which becomes human *is not the man*" (I, 184). This monad had unfolded its potentiality to the highest degree possible from the "matter side" and this development made it capable of being enshrined in the human astral form. While not the *Man,* it is the *only form* which has the possibility of uniting itself with the *Man.* In other words, the human astral form is the only form capable of catching and reflecting the *direct* light of the Logos, or the Light of Spiritual Self-consciousness. When Nature has given birth to its highest product—the human astral body—another class of "creators" steps upon the scene and lights up the forms with the divine light of mind and self-consciousness. These are the Solar Pitris, or ourselves, truly, as Manasic or Thinking Beings. This second spiritual impulsion is directed and aided by the Sons of Wisdom, our Elder Brothers, for "Nature Unaided Fails." This aid at a crucial and balancing point in the grand cycle of evolution is mentioned by Mr. Judge on page 47 of the *Ocean* in his reference to the course of the Sun through the Zodiac: "This fourth principle is like the sign Libra in the

path of the Sun through the Zodiac; when the Sun (who is the real man) reaches that sign he trembles in the balance. Should he go back the worlds would be destroyed; he goes onward, and the whole human race is lifted up to perfection."

Once it is clearly perceived that evolution is at all times an impulsion from Spirit, then it is easy to understand that all forms or bodies are both the "creations" of Consciousness, and the temporary, objective and progressive indices of the degrees of growth made by the indwelling divine Beings in their long cyclic pilgrimages throughout the Manvantara. An incisive reference on this point is found in *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 282):

> Everything that *is, was,* and *will be,* eternally is, even the countless forms, which are finite and perishable only in their objective, not in their *ideal* Form. They existed as Ideas, in the Eternity, and when they pass away, will exist as reflections. Neither the form of man, nor that of any animal, plant or stone has ever been *created,* and it is only on this plane of ours that it commenced "becoming," *i.e.,* objectivising into its present materiality, or expanding from *within without,* from the most sublimated and supersensuous essence into its grossest appearance. Therefore *our* human forms existed in the Eternity as astral or ethereal prototypes; according to which models, the Spiritual Beings (or Gods) whose duty it was to bring them into objective being and terrestrial Life, evolved the protoplasmic forms of the future *Egos* from *their own essence.*

Mr. Judge in "The Synthesis of Occult Science" says much the same thing in these words: "The tissue cells constitute man's bodily structure, but the order in which they are arranged, the principle upon which they are grouped, constituting the human *form,* is not simply an evolved shape from the lower animal plane, but an *involved* principle from a higher plane, and older world, *viz.* the 'Lunar Pitris'."

Once the fire of *Manas* is lighted up in the astral man the possibilities of further evolution are well-nigh limitless. In the *Ocean,* Mr. Judge indicates the infinite vistas opening up for the Monad in his statement that another great race was thus prepared for final initiation. On page 181 of *S.D.* I, when discussing the physical line of evolution represented by the Chhayas (or astral forms) of the lunar Pitris, round which Nature has concreted the present physical body, H.P.B. wrote: "This body serves as the vehicle for the 'growth' (to use a misleading word) and the transformations through Manas and—owing to the accumula-

tion of experiences—of the finite into the INFINITE, of the transient into the Eternal and Absolute." The term "body" in this excerpt seems to refer to both the astral and the physical bodies, or rather the two-in-one, for the incarnation of Manas is marked by the final descent of the divine Ego to the lowest plane of matter. To enable him to function on this plane man now acquires his "coat of skin"; or, as expressed in the above passage, "Nature has concreted the present physical form around the astral." With the descent to this terrestrial plane, the Manasic-Man is, now, in the fullest sense, the link between Spirit and Matter; and he has the power, and it is his divine duty and mission, to raise up and spiritualize the beings in the kingdoms below him; without his aid, neither they *nor* he can progress further. He cannot progress because he has sidestepped his duty; they, because powerless.

The essence of the doctrine that evolution begins in Spirit is profoundly moral. Spirit is one with the Desire which first arose in IT. It is Kama in its primeval purity, "the first conscious, *all embracing desire* for universal good, love, and for all that lives and feels, needs help and kindness, the first feeling of infinite tender compassion and mercy that first arose in the consciousness of the creative ONE FORCE, as soon as it came into life and being as a ray from the ABSOLUTE." (*Glossary,* under *Kamadeva.*) This is perhaps part of the genealogy of the "Heart Doctrine"—that of UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.

As every human being is a combination of Spirit or the Higher Self, and Matter, or the lower personal self, there is a part of his being which is always in need of help from a higher plane. The child needs the help of his parents; the pupil unaided by a teacher fails; and every aspirant to higher Wisdom is in constant need of the advice and guidance of Those who have gone before. This law of Universal Brotherhood, of the mutual interdependence of all beings, extends from the highest to the lowest, from the wisest to the most ignorant, so that no struggling pilgrim, however predominant the principle of Matter may be in his nature, is outside the purvue of higher Spiritual Beings.

Intimately bound up with nature, the animal cannot question it. The animal is *one* with nature, while man and nature make *two.* To pass from passive unconsciousness to questioning consciousness there had to be a wrenching away from nature.

—JEAN BRULLER

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER

MANY worthy men who belong to established religious institutions are engaged in the liberalization of these institutions in the hope that a greater majority of people will be able to reach a truer spiritual understanding. Should not Theosophists, themselves, become affiliated with "liberal religion"?

As long as there are established religious institutions there will be philosophers to rationalize their existence. Present-day Church apologists are perhaps nervously attempting to compromise between religious conservatism and reason. There are probably varied arguments on "why a person should belong to a church"; here are a few which seem typical.

"Consider, first, that while it is true that religious institutions have been instruments of destruction, tyranny, and fanaticism, the institution cannot be made responsible for all crimes committed in its name. When a man abuses an instrument, or machine, you do not denounce the instrument—you denounce the abuser. Therefore, a religious institution is as good as the men who compose it; man is capable of correct as well as incorrect religious action."

"Faith seems to be a necessary component of this civilization, whether it be faith in a political doctrine, in science, or in religion. Faith in religion, some psychologists know, provides for an integrality of character which is to be valued. This is because men equate the higher, social mores of mercy, justice, kindness and love toward one's fellow man with the religion of the church. In this way, the religious institutions have come to symbolize a high moral standard. From this, we can see that the religious institutions bring nearer the realization of the Brotherhood of Man."

"Primitive rituals, magical rites, and religious myths have served throughout history as organizing principles in emotional and moral conduct. The rituals and symbology of the church have stood for, in our culture, the higher and deeper values of this civilization. These rituals and symbolic acts in which church members participate are *commitments* to these higher values. The very act of prayer, even religious festivals and songs, are examples of this. And church social gather-

ings prove to be beneficial to the entire community, contributing to its happiness. Symbols, themselves, are not to be taken literally, but as something to stand for an ideal. Believing in an ideal and believing in a definite object are very different. The first is a commitment while the second requires objective verification. In this light, the rituals of religion are symbols to express our commitment to a spiritual good."

The position thus taken—let us call its spokesmen "Restitutionist Liberals,"—seems to rest on three approaches. (1) An institution can be used for good as well as bad purposes. (2) Since faith is a necessary part of our society, the faith in the higher ideals of religion proves to be better than other "faiths." (3) In committing ourselves "by act of ritual" (prayer, song, etc.) through the church, we will be better able to live up to a higher standard of morality. We shall consider these positions in order.

Using the same illustration of the machine, is there not such a thing as an "antiquated" machine? Theoretically, the church is an instrument of ideas. But when we institutionalize certain ideas of a certain age of thought into certain modes of ritualistic expression, we place limitations on the ideas—the limitations of that particular age's expression. How could we assume that the votaries of church theology are giving *the* interpretation of *the* ideas? The very act of establishing certain specific ideas and sanctioning them with an institution is in direct denial of cumulative truth. Eternal fundamentals may exist *in* ideas, but anyone familiar with the majority of churches knows that they are concerned with more than philosophy and metaphysics. Ideas are to be *considered,* but not *believed.* Acceptance should come only after a long process of understanding, and must be an individual instead of a group matter.

The fact that the stabilizing benefits derived from faith can be obtained from widely differing ideologies demonstrates that it is from "the willingness to believe" that apparent stabilization is gained. This "benefit" probably comes, in most cases, from the fact that the anxieties we experience from problems that appear insoluble have no longer to be faced. The positivist makes physical experiment his God, and the religious fanatic says, simply, "God knows." In one sense both mean stepping away from faith in *internal reason.* It must be remembered that the "high moral standards" sometimes represented by men of the church do not necessarily make of church theology a moral authority.

If a slave-owner were suddenly to start advocating humanitarian standards toward his slaves, it would not alter the fact that he is a slave-owner. Slavery is an antiquated form of society, and the church may be an antiquated institution *in* society.

A symbol, by the very derivation of the word, is an inference. Once an "authority" has given categorical explanation of the meaning of a symbol, it is no longer a symbol. Symbols, then, are matters of individual interpretation and do not require authoritative institutions for their explanation. If we are to conceive of God as an externality, perhaps, *then* it does require external, overt acts (in the form of ritual) to remind us of an external standard of morality. However, if our "God" is located within man, it would seem to be a contradiction to kneel and pray, saying: "Dear God within, please help me through this crucial situation," because if anyone is to help us through the situation it can only be ourselves. Rites and rituals may give us temporary psychological comfort, but sooner or later, it would seem, we shall have to shoulder the problem ourselves.

What should a Theosophist do if he feels that a platform speaker is merely expressing something he believes in blindly?

(a) Can we condemn a person because he *appears* to be saying something dogmatically? Perhaps we ourselves may be taking a dogmatic approach by feeling sure that our judgment is correct.

It would devolve upon the individual listening, also, to discern the difference between dogmatism and conviction of truth.

Whether or not the speaker qualifies his statements sufficiently, isn't it the *ideas* that count—can they be made false or any truer, no matter how a person talks? Again, we might ask ourselves, how can we determine that there is any value in the facts presented? Any honest, impartial judge would examine for himself the evidence offered, as well as the method of presenting it or its interpretation. In Theosophy, no one is asked to believe in anything; the Ego's efforts to find the truth for himself being respected.

(b) Whether or not the inquirer is correct in his assumption, there is a clear avenue of investigation. He is free to talk personally with the speaker; to question logic or points of doctrine, or even question personal attitudes. The questioner will possibly be told that all persons are but students of Theosophy and therefore subject to error. In this respect it is the policy of U.L.T. to call attention to ideas and to

consider these ideas on their own inherent worth, trying to overlook the personality or circumstances involved. Did the inquirer seem attracted to the basic ideas presented? Maybe he would care to see the words of H.P.B. or Mr. Judge on the subject?

Those who come only as doubters will assuredly leave as doubters, being unable to lay aside their prejudices. Theosophy, though, is for *questioners,* for they have already taken steps toward the acquirement of truth. H.P.B. repeatedly insisted upon the need for unprejudiced, open inquiry.

(c) How could one tell what is blind faith and what settled conviction? One would need to have a great deal of knowledge himself before he could tell what another understands merely by his expression of an idea. Remember Mr. Judge's discussion of settled conviction *vs.* blind faith in the Preface to the *Ocean?* Many there were who took his knowledge and means of expression as blind faith. Could they tell what was really his conviction? Perhaps the inquirer might have an opportunity to question the speaker—during or after the meeting. If the speaker speaks from knowledge, he must surely be able to give a logical explanation which would appeal to the listener's sense of reason. But the questioner must at least come with an open mind. If he were *convinced* that Theosophy is blindly dogmatic, little could be done to change his mind.

This question is important for all of us. Are we sure what we say from the platform is the result of careful thought, and have we convinced ourselves that what we are saying has a basis in truth for us? If not, we are going to give the impression that ours is a blind belief rather than a conviction based on knowledge. But, one may say, there are many things in the teachings which we haven't been able to prove to ourselves, *e.g.,* matters concerning cosmic evolution, etc. If it is our task to speak on such subjects, can we be accused of expressing blind belief if we simply state we are presenting what has been written in a certain book? If we are convinced of the basic principles of Theosophy, too, we can use them as a basis upon which to draw logical conclusions concerning the area of thought being considered. By analogy and correspondence one could give a logical answer, speaking intelligently upon the philosophic and psychological background of the tenets of Theosophy when the occasion arises.

ANTECEDENT EGYPT

The race of Io, "the cow-horned maid," is simply the *first pioneer race of the Æthiopians* brought by her from the Indus to the Nile, which receives its name from the mother river of the colonists from India. —*The Secret Doctrine*

ONE million years are allowed for our present root Race (Aryan); 850,000 years since the submersion of the last great island (part of the continent), the Ruta of the Fourth Race, or the Atlanteans; while Daitya, a small island inhabited by a mixed race, was destroyed about 270,000 years ago, during the glacial period, or thereabouts. The [elder] Egyptians are descendants of the Ruta Atlanteans. Egypt is far older than Europe as now traced on the map.

Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson's declaration that "all the facts lead to the conclusion that the Egyptians had already made very great progress in the arts of civilization *before the age of Menes*" is very suggestive. It points to a great civilization in prehistoric times, and a still greater antiquity. The Schesoo-Hor (the servants of Horus) were a people who had settled in Egypt; and as M. G. Maspero affirms, it is to this prehistoric race that "belongs the honour of having founded the principal cities of Egypt, and established the most important sanctuaries." This was before the great Pyramidal epoch, and when Egypt had hardly arisen from the waters. Yet they "possessed the hieroglyphic form of writing special to the Egyptians, and must have been already considerably advanced in civilization." H. A. Taine shows that the civilizations of such archaic nations as the Egyptians and Aryans of India are the result of preceding civilizations during myriads of centuries. Professor R. Owen adds, "Egypt is recorded to having been a civilized and governed community before the time of Menes."

Herodotus was shown, by the priests of Egypt, the statues of their human kings and Pontiffs-piromis (the archi-prophets or Maha-Chohans of the temples) born one from the other (without the intervention of woman), who had *reigned before Menes,* their first human king. These statues, he says, were enormous colossi in wood, three hundred and forty-five in number, each of which had its name, history

---

NOTE—Collated from standard Theosophical Works.

and annals. And they assured Herodotus that no historian could ever understand or write an account of these superhuman Kings, unless he had studied and learned the history of the three dynasties that preceded the human—namely, the DYNASTIES OF THE GODS, that of demi-gods, and of the Heroes or giants. These "three dynasties" are the three races. The earliest Egyptians had been separated from the latest Atlanteans for ages upon ages; they had themselves descended from an alien race, and had settled in Egypt some 400,000 years before, but their Initiates had preserved all the records.

Concerning Aryan immigration to Egypt in the days of Menes, it is said: "Under the reign of Visvamitra, first King of the (Indian) Dynasty of Soma-Vanga, in consequence of a battle which lasted five days, Manu-Vina, heir of the ancient Kings, being abandoned by the Brahmans, emigrated with all his companions, passing through Arya, and the countries of Barria, till he came to the shores of Masra." (*History of India,* by Collouca-Batta.) Arya is Iran (Persia); Barria is Arabia, and Masra was the name of Cairo. Unquestionably this Manu-Vina and *Menes,* the first Egyptian King, are identical. The two nations—India and Egypt—were akin, and were the oldest in the group of nations. In our opinion, the Egyptians were the ancient Indians. Atlanto-Aryan tribes began to settle in Egypt, when the British Islands and France were not even in existence. Later tribes, with still more Aryan blood in them than their predecessors, arrived from the East, and conquered it from a people whose very name is lost to posterity, except in secret works. We are prepared to maintain that Egypt owes her civilization, commonwealth and arts—especially the art of building, to pre-Vedic India, and that it was a colony of the dark-skinned Aryans, or those whom Homer and Herodotus term the Eastern Ethiopians, the inhabitants of Southern India—who brought to it their ready-made civilization in the ante-chronological ages. The Eastern Ethiopians, the mighty builders, came from India as a matured people, bringing their civilization with them and colonizing a *perhaps unoccupied territory.* The *human* dynasty of the older Egyptians, beginning with Menes, had all the *knowledge* of the Atlanteans though there was no more Atlantean blood in their veins.

The Hierophants of Egypt generally styled themselves the "Sons of the Serpent God," or "Sons of the Dragon," during the Mysteries. In the world of Paganism, the counterpart of the Serpent is the second

Hermes, the reincarnation of Hermes Trismegistus. Hermes is the constant companion and instructor of Osiris and Isis. Both build cities, civilize and instruct mankind in the arts. And here we may as well mention the works of Hermes Trismegistus. Who, or how many, have had the opportunity to read them as they were in the Egyptian sanctuaries? In his *Egyptian Mysteries,* Iamblichus attributes to Hermes 1,100 books and Seleucus reckons no less than 20,000 of his works before the period of Menes. Of such manuscripts as have descended to us, most are but Latin translations of Greek translations, made principally by the Neo-Platonists from the original books *preserved by some Adepts.* The 42 Sacred Books of the Egyptians mentioned by Clement of Alexandria as having existed in his time, were but a portion of the Books of Hermes. Of these, 36 contained the history of all human knowledge; the last six treated of anatomy, of pathology, of affections of the eye, instruments of surgery, and of medicines.

No subsequent people has been so proficient in geometry as the builders of the Pyramids. And all archaeologists now agree that the further back we go into history, the better and finer become the arts. In the temple of Dendera, which contained the renowned zodiacs, every one of the stones is covered with hieroglyphics; and the more ancient they are the more beautifully we find them chiseled. We can judge of the lofty civilizations reached in some periods of antiquity by the historical descriptions of the ages of the Ptolemies, yet in that epoch the arts and sciences were considered to be degenerating, and the secret of a number of the former had already been lost. In the excavations of Marietta Bey, at the root of the Pyramids, statues of wood and other relics have been exhumed, which show that long before the period of the first dynasties the Egyptians had attained to a refinement and perfection which is calculated to excite the wonder of even the most ardent admirers of Grecian art. Sir Gardner Wilkinson says that he "can trace no *primitive* mode of life, no barbarous customs, but a sort of stationary civilization from the most remote periods."

As far back as we can glance into history—to the reign of Menes—the most ancient of the kings that we know anything about, we find proofs that the Egyptians were far better acquainted with hydrostatics and hydraulic engineering than ourselves. The gigantic work of turning the course of the Nile and bringing it to Memphis was accomplished during the reign of that monarch. Says Wilkinson: "Menes took

accurately the measure of the power he had to oppose, and he constructed a dyke whose lofty mounds and enormous embankments turned the water eastward, and since that time the river is contained in its new bed." The Romans, at a far later period, got their notions on hydraulic construction from the Egyptians. The Egyptians evidently employed a far superior method in their channels and artificial waterworks.

For a distance of 500 miles above Cairo, there stretches a strip of land reclaimed from the desert, and made, according to Professor Carpenter, "the most fertile on the face of the earth." He says: "For thousands of years these branch canals have conveyed fresh water from the Nile, to fertilize the land of this long narrow strip, as well as of the Delta." He describes "the network of canals over the Delta which dates from an early period of the Egyptian monarchs." In ancient times, the principal mouth of the river was called Pelusian; and the canal cut by one of the kings—the canal of Necho—led from Suez to this branch. After the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra, it was proposed that a portion of the fleet should pass through the canal to the Red Sea, which shows the depth of water that those early engineers had secured.

If modern masters are so much in advance of the old ones, why do they not restore to us the lost arts of our postdiluvian fathers? Why do they not give us the *unfading colors of Luxor,* the indestructible cement of the pyramids and of ancient aqueducts? Stevens, in his work on the East, asserts that he found railroads in Upper Egypt, whose grooves were coated with iron. We may remind our readers of the many hints to be found in the ancient histories as to a certain secret in the possession of the Egyptian priesthood, who could instantly communicate, during the celebration of the Mysteries, from one temple to another, even though the former were at Thebes and the latter at the other end of the country. The author of *Pre-Adamite Man* found good evidence, during his stay in Egypt, that "one of the Cleopatras sent news *by wire* to all the cities, from Heliopolis to Elephantine, on the Upper Nile."

The discovery is claimed by the ancient Egyptians, those sons of the Land of Chemistry (Chem—whence the term alchemy and chemistry), of perpetually burning lamps. At least, they were the people who used these lamps far more than any other nation, on account of their religious doctrines. The astral soul of the mummy was believed to be

lingering about the body for the whole space of three thousand years of the circle of necessity. Attached to it by a magnetic thread, which could be broken but by its own exertion, the Egyptians hoped that the ever-burning lamp, symbol of their incorruptible and immortal spirit, would at last decide the more material soul to part with its earthly dwelling, and unite forever with its divine SELF. Therefore lamps were hung in the sepulchres of the rich. Such lamps are often found in the subterranean caves of the dead, and Licetus has written a large folio to prove that in his time, whenever a sepulchre was opened, a burning lamp was found within the tomb, but was instantaneously extinguished on account of the desecration.

Says Glidden: "Philologists, astronomers, chemists, painters, architects, physicians, must return to Egypt to learn the origin of language and writing; of the calendar and solar motion; of the art of cutting granite with a copper chisel and of giving elasticity to a copper sword; of making glass with the variegated hues of the rainbow; of moving single blocks of polished syenite, nine hundred tons in weight, for any distance, by land or water; of building arches, rounded and pointed, with masonic precision unsurpassed at the present day; of sculpturing a Doric column 1,000 years before the Dorians are known in history; of fresco painting in imperishable colors; of practical knowledge in anatomy; and of time-defying pyramid building. Every craftsman can behold, in Egyptian monuments, the progress of his art 4,000 years ago [?]; and whether it be a wheelwright building a chariot, a shoemaker drawing his twine, a leather cutter using the selfsame form of knife of old as is considered the best form now, a weaver throwing the selfsame shuttle, a whitesmith using the identical form of blow pipe but lately recognized to be the most efficient, the seal-engraver cutting, in hieroglyphs, such names as Shooho's—all these, and many more astounding evidences of Egyptian priority, now require but a glance at the plates of Rossellini."

The Egyptians excelled in all the arts. They made *paper* so excellent in quality as to be time-proof. "They took out the pith of the papyrus," says an anonymous author, "dissected and opened the fibre, and, flattening it by a process known to them, made it as thin as our foolscap paper, but far more durable. . . ." It is now known that the art of writing was known and used as early as the days of Menes, and thus it was finally discovered that the art and the system of writing were *perfect and com-*

plete from the very first. The newly discovered papyrus of Ebers, the German archaeologist, proves that neither our modern chignons, skin-beautifying pearl powders, nor *eaux dentifrices* were secrets to them. More than one modern physician even among those who advertise themselves as having made a specialty of nervous disorders—may find his advantage in consulting the *Medical Books of Hermes,* which contain prescriptions of real therapeutic value. The Egyptians understood about the circulation of the blood . . . had their dentists and oculists, and no doctor was allowed to practice more than one specialty. Says Dr. Grandville: "There is not a single form of bandage known to modern surgery of which far better and cleverer examples are not seen in the swathings of the mummies. The strips of linen are found without one single joint, extending to 1,000 yards in length."

The art of making fine linen is also proved to have been one of their branches of knowledge. The linen of Egypt was famous throughout the world. Pliny speaks of a certain garment sent 600 B.C. by King Amasis to Lindus, every single thread of which was composed of 360 minor threads twisted together. The linen was spun and dyed in those brilliant and gorgeous colors, the secret of which is also now among the lost arts. On the mummies we find the most beautiful embroidery and bead-work. The elaborate and much vaunted Gobelins tapestry is but a gross production when compared with some of the embroidery of the ancient Egyptians. All the ornamental arts seem to have been known to them. Their jewelry of gold and silver, and precious stones are beautifully wrought; so was the cutting, polishing and setting of them executed by their lapidaries in the finest style. The finger ring of an Egyptian mummy was pronounced the most artistic piece of jewelry in the London exhibition of 1851. Their imitation of precious stones in glass is far above anything done now; and the emerald may be said to have been imitated to perfection. Dioscorides speaks of the stone of Memphis, and describes it as a small pebble. When ground to powder, and applied as an ointment to that part of the body on which the surgeon was about to operate, it preserved that part, and only that part from any pain during the operation.

The proof that they were proficient in the mathematical sciences, lies in the fact that those ancient mathematicians whom we honor as the fathers of geometry went to Egypt to be instructed. Says Professor Smyth: "The geometrical knowledge of the pyramid builders began

where Euclid's ended." If we turn to architecture, we find displayed before our eyes wonders which baffle all description. Professor Carpenter is amazed at the admirable character of workmanship; the stones in most cases being fitted together with astonishing nicety, so that a knife could hardly be thrust between the joints. He also noticed that in the *Book of the Dead,* sculptured on the old monuments, were used the very phrases that we find in the *New Testament.*

It is also a well demonstrated fact that the true meridian was correctly ascertained *before the first pyramid was built.* They had clocks and dials to measure time; their cubit was the established unit of linear measure; according to Herodotus, the unit of weight was also known; as money, they had gold and silver rings valued by weight; they had the decimal and duodecimal modes of calculation from the earliest times, and were proficient in algebra. The pyramid of Cheops is built upon the measures of this decimal notation.

The most ancient Egyptains cultivated the musical arts, and understood well the effect of musical harmony and its influence on the human spirit. Music was used in the Healing Department of the temples for the cure of nervous disorders. We discover on many monuments men playing in bands in concert; the leader beating time by clapping his hands. The lyre, harp and flute were used for the sacred concerts; for festive occasions they had the guitar, the single and double pipes, and castinets; for troops, and during military service they had trumpets, tambourines, drums and cymbals. Various kinds of harps were invented by them, such as the lyre, sambuc, ashur; some of these had upward of twenty strings. The superiority of the Egyptian over the Grecian lyre is an admitted fact. They used catgut for strings as we do. Pythagoras learned music in Egypt, and made a regular science of it in Italy. The Egyptians were considered in antiquity the best music teachers in Greece.

The mind and soul of old Egypt, as of other *ancient* nations, are being reincarnated in the West. Who may estimate what the true greatness of the Americas, and of Old India, ages ahead, may be? Cycle upon cycle of rediscovery and perfection of old arts and sciences lie beyond for those "mighty builders," measures of which will appear and take needed form as one by one the points, corresponding in grandeur to the Old, are reached by New ascending races. We are assured by those who know that *much* is in store.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Lincoln's Theosophy

Writing in the *New Yorker* on the recently issued *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (Rutgers University Press), Edmund Wilson emphasizes aspects of Lincoln's philosophy which will be of special interest to Theosophists. Actually, the *New Yorker* piece amounts to a thorough historical essay. Wilson approaches Lincoln as he did the controversial figures of radical history featured in his *To the Finland Station*—seeking, first of all, the nature of those ideative aspirations which later found expression in political efforts and social doctrines. Lincoln, Wilson helps his readers to see, was a mystic, but not, in any orthodox sense, a Christian.

Familiar "Fundamentals"

A reader of Voltaire and Tom Paine, Lincoln seems to have been especially influenced by the latter, for, as Wilson quotes from Herndon, "he soon grew into the belief of a universal law, evolution, and from this he has never deviated. . . ." Herndon continues:

> Mr. Lincoln believed in laws that imperiously ruled both matter and mind. With him there could be no miracles outside of law; he held that the universe was a grand mystery and a miracle. . . . There were no accidents in his philosophy. Every effect had its cause. The past to him was the cause of the present, and the present, including the past, will be the cause of the grand future, and all are one, links in the endless chain, stretching from the infinite to the finite. Everything to him was the result of the forces of Nature, playing on matter and mind from the beginning of time, giving the world other, further, and grander results.

Paradox or Subtlety?

Since there are few Americans who do not feel great respect, if not veneration, for Lincoln, the Christians have been eager to prove that Lincoln was a "properly God-fearing man." In many of Lincoln's utterances, the word God does indeed appear, but Mr. Wilson, in sifting material presented in the *Collected Works,* indicates that the Civil War President simply did not wish to exacerbate religious divisiveness, and whenever possible, employed unifying symbols. "God," in Lincoln's

writing, becomes a symbol for Plato's "Good"—that is, for the mental and spiritual forces which work towards the fulfillment of human destiny. Wilson comments on the only known public statement by Lincoln on his religious views:

> When Lincoln was running for Congress in 1846, his Democratic opponent, a Methodist preacher, denounced him for infidelity. Lincoln then made a point of writing and publishing in a local paper a statement of his religious views, the only one he ever made, which seems to have satisfied his public. When we examine it closely, however, we see that this clarification is not really a confession of faith; it does not commit Lincoln to anything.

No Change of Philosophy

> He speaks of a Doctrine of Necessity in which he had once been inclined to believe, but says that he has ceased to discuss it, and ends by saying that he would not care to support any man for office "whom I knew to be an open enemy of, and scoffer at, religion" on the ground that no man "has the right to insult the feelings, and injure the morals, of the community in which he may live." Herndon had admitted that the Doctrine of Necessity had a conception of divinity behind it: "He firmly believed in an overruling Providence, Maker, God, and the great moral of Him written in the human soul. His—late in life—conventional use of the word God must not by any means be interpreted that he believed in a personal God. I know that it is said Mr. Lincoln changed his views. There is no evidence of this."

An Article Worth Owning

Mr. Wilson's lengthy and informative piece appeared in the March 14 issue of the *New Yorker* as a book review, but might also be regarded as the most instructive essay of similar length upon Lincoln ever made available. While dissociating the martyred president from religious orthodoxy, Wilson establishes the fact that Lincoln could not share the idea that the *Bible* is a special or direct revelation from "God." The reader is helped to perceive that true religion consists of inspiration from within, joined with a "mystical" sense of deep response to the natural moral laws of the universe.

Lincoln's "mysticism" is further characterized by reference to his dream-premonitions in regard to his own death. He seemed to know, by 1860, that he would be elected to the second term, yet would not live to complete it and so informed John Hay and others who surrounded him on the night of his second election. A few days before

his assassination, Lincoln tried to prepare his friends for the event which his dreams indicated was due to occur, but refused to accept a bodyguard, believing that above all things he must maintain his part of the relationship of trust which should surround high office. As Wilson puts it, he "wanted the people to know that 'I come among them without fear'."

Thus we are able to see that, despite the superficial differences, Lincoln and India's "First Statesman" M. K. Gandhi, were men of similar beliefs. Gandhi, too, held a great land united for a considerable time. Gandhi, too, used the word "God" as a symbol for the sincere faith of many that a spiritual reality pervades all of life. But neither believed in "special revelations" or formal theology, seeing rather the rule of Law in all things, and man's power of free choice as the source of the "networks of destiny" which eventually were spun out on the loom of history.

Religion and Mental Illness

A brief AP dispatch in the Los Angeles *Mirror* for May 8 discussed the types of mental illness most commonly found to be associated with the various sectarian religions, bringing to light such information as the following:

> The report shows that psychoneuroses are a principal mental ailment among Jews; that alcoholism and epilepsy are the chief disorders of Catholics, and that Protestants are burdened with still other mental troubles.

Polite Phrasing

Although Mr. Rennie Taylor, the AP science reporter, obviously tries to spare the feelings of sectarian adherents, and claims that the "massive" Yale study shows "that no religious group has the edge when it comes to mental health," members of the American Psychiatric Association, before whom the evidence was presented, will probably regard these statistics as a milestone in the gathering of data concerning social neuroses. ("Social neurosis," generally speaking, means a complex tension which tends to malform human personality. The source, of course, is societal stress and strain.)

"Findings" for Different Groups

It is easy to understand, for instance, why psychoneuroses run high among the Jews, since the Semitic peoples in general are still subjected

to many indirect forms of persecution. Psychologists have long recognized Catholicism to be a vast escape-mechanism, which provides an easy way to abrogate individual moral responsibility, so that it is not surprising that alcoholism runs high in that group. The association of seventy-one per cent of the epileptics, though, with Catholicism, would have to be explained on more obscure grounds—perhaps having something to do with the inevitable relatedness between habits of authoritarian acceptance and various forms of passivity or "mediumship" in other lives.

It's Hard to be Self-Reliant

As the following quotation indicates, the Protestants have shown more signs of internal nervous tension, incident to a greater assumption of personal responsibility for their own natures and predicaments. Their "migraine and stuttering" might, in this comparative study, be regarded as badges of honor. According to the *Mirror* story:

> Jews had two and one-half times as much psychoneurosis percentagewise as the general population of the area, the researchers reported. Catholics comprised 57.5% of the population but they had 68.5% of all the alcoholism and drug cases, and 71.5% of the epilepsy. Schizophrenia, a form of insanity, ran slightly high among Catholics, about average among Jews, and slightly low among Protestants.
>
> The Protestant group ran high in the organic diseases associated with mental trouble, such as migraine and stuttering, and also high in mental troubles connected with age.

Catholicism in Spain

While the Theosophist seeks to avoid condemning and criticizing members of any creed or sect, history itself forces him to give considerable critical attention to implications of Catholic doctrine. Recently, the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* (April 30) contained some disquieting news from Franco's Spain, as reported by Salvador de Madariaga. This writer's conclusion is that "the Spanish Church takes the side of fascism in the Civil War which the dictator perpetuates. Let us all hope that she will be spared the consequences of her own blindness."

Retrogression

Spain had a democratic revolution in 1868, and, as a consequence, academic freedom has long been guaranteed—the sort of freedom,

incidentally, in which a mind like José Ortega y Gasset's could flourish. The Franco regime, however, needed Catholic support so badly that, in Madariaga's words, "the Ministry of Education has been virtually handed over to the ecclesiastical authorities." He continues in description of two widely distributed, official "indexes" of an incredibly medieval nature:

> They are both booklets of roughly fifty pages octavo; but a more ambitious work should also be studied: a commentary on Father Ripalda's catechism by a layman, Garcia Mazo, in collaboration with a Jesuit, Father Diez Hidalgo (Madrid, 1949).
>
> This work is remarkable in that it adopts and even enlarges upon an Appendix on Modern Errors added to both Catechisms by yet another Jesuit, Father Märquez. This section asserts that the chief modern errors condemned by the Church are fourteen, to wit: materialism, Darwinism, atheism, pantheism, deism, rationalism, protestantism, socialism, communism, syndicalism, laicism, liberalism, modernism and Freemasonry. The teaching and profession of these errors is declared to be a mortal sin.

Freemasonry Misrepresented

A definition of Freemasonry is also couched in the question-and-arbitrary-answer style so prevalent among Catholic pronouncements:

> "What is Freemasonry?"—"A perverse society which, under cover of humanitarian aims, contrives in its mysterious dens the ruin of society and of the Church." "Through what means does it seek to achieve such perverse ends?"—"Through crime, hypocrisy, and mystery."

From this diatribe on Freemasonry, it is but a short step to the condemnation of freedom of conscience:

> "What does freedom of conscience mean?"—"That anyone can profess the religion his conscience dictates, and if none, none." "Is it a fact that man may choose any religion he likes?"—"No, for he must profess the Roman Apostolic Catholic, which is the only true religion there is." "Must not the State protect the opinion of all its subjects?"—"Yes, sir, provided they are not condemned by the Church." (This, of course, leaves unprotected the fourteen opinions listed above.)
>
> "What is freedom of the press?"—"The faculty of printing and publishing without previous censorship every kind of opinion, no matter how absurd or corrupting it may be." "Should the Government repress such freedom by means of a censorship?"—"Obviously, yes." "Are there other pernicious liberties?"—"Yes, sir: academic freedom,

freedom of propaganda and of meeting." "Why are they pernicious?" "Because they are useful for teaching errors, propagating vice, and conspiring against the Church."

"MAN'S VITAL NEED OF SUN MADE PLAIN"

Theosophists will respond with interest to a column in the Los Angeles *Times* (May 24) under the above title, by J. Hugh Pruett, Astronomer, Extension Division, Oregon Higher Education System. Dr. Pruett tells of an experience shared with astronomy students, who, after some solar study seemed to feel deep appreciation of the sun and, almost, a kind of worship.

Daily association with the sun's rays apparently opened up another dimension of perception in the observers. Students began to feel as did Dr. Pruett himself, that "the worship of primitive man humbly bowing before the glory of the rising sun hardly can seem a useless form of praise."

A "PECULIAR" EXPERIENCE

The value of Dr. Pruett's experience would seem to be that it supplies the missing link in the usual text-book approach to the phenomena of nature, and students of Theosophy are persuaded that this missing dimension is prerequisite in arriving at a feeling for "the oneness of life."

Dr. Pruett recounts his impressions:

> A peculiar experience came to this writer a few years ago. For two sunlit weeks, each afternoon was spent at the observatory directing solar study for various small groups from the university astronomy class.
>
> The spring weather was inspiring and the sky blue. The students were eager and interested. The sun was furnishing abundant light for study through various instruments.
>
> In the telescopes and on the projection screen every day the warm face of old Sol greeted us. . . . And through the spectroscope the solar light was spread out into a long ribbon of most exquisitely beautiful colors, ranging from deep red at one end on through orange, yellow, green and blue to rich violet at the other end. Dark lines crossing this rainbow band indicated the various substances in the sun's atmosphere.

LOVE OF SUN GROWS

> After several days of this an unusual love for our sun developed, a feeling almost of worshipful adoration. Whether this was due to

> continued exposure to the sun's genial warmth and health-giving properties, or to the beautiful effects viewed through the instruments, or to the contact with eager and surprised youthful minds—or to all combined—was not certain. . . . But as never before, it seemed fitting to join in the devotions of the ancient sun worshippers and exclaim: "Resplendent and wonderful Thou art!"

The foregoing would seem to bear out the claims of the "nature" enthusiasts as to the benefits flowing from reflective awareness of natural surroundings. In remote antiquity, H. P. Blavatsky wrote, it was realized that the visible sun is the vital life-giving energizer of our planet, and that its proper symbolic "worship" led to a deeper realization of the reciprocal relationship between man and the rest of nature.

The Hidden Sun

H.P.B. also remarked, however, "that none of the ancients, the sun-worshippers included, regarded our visible sun otherwise than as an emblem of their metaphysical, invisible, central sun-god." She summarizes the dual aspect of the sun in the following manner:

> The Sun is matter, and the Sun is Spirit. Our ancestors—the "heathen,"—along with their modern successors, the Parsis—were, and are, wise enough in their generation to see in it the symbol of Divinity, and at the same time to sense within, concealed by the physical Symbol, the bright God of Spiritual and terrestrial Light. . . . It is the "Spirit of Light," the first born of the Eternal pure Element, whose energy (or emanation) is stored in the Sun, the great Life-Giver of the physical world, as the hidden Concealed Spiritual Sun is the Light- and Life-Giver of the Spiritual and Psychic Realms.

Dr. Pruett seems to have intuitively felt likewise, for he calls attention to "one of the oldest prayers from the Sanskrit":

> Oh Thou true Sun, now hidden by a disk of gold, may we come to know Thy reality and do our full duty on our journey to Thy light.

Since in Theosophical writings it is asserted that the hidden aspect of the sun is a mystery which relates to the hidden aspect in man, the "Gayatri" can be seen to have an inner meaning. Further, reflection upon the visible aspect of the sun soon leads the serious student of the occult side of Nature into the potencies of the Unseen Universe. We may wonder what intimations in respect to man's spiritual self may come to some of the students who participated in Dr. Pruett's short course.

"Current Views on Psychotherapy"

Franz Alexander, of the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis, presents this careful survey in the May *Psychiatry*. Of particular interest to Theosophists will be his critical revaluation of psychoanalytic techniques. As Trigant Burrow discovered many years ago, the analyst is practically incapable of restraining the projections of his own personality during sessions with a patient, and thus one of the unnoticed problems of Freud's original concept of therapy is revealed. Dr. Alexander remarks that "we must take into consideration the analyst's attitude toward the patient," which may easily result in a sort of "counter transference," by way of the projection of the analyst's personality upon the patient.

The "Two-Way Street"

Dr. Alexander continues:

> Freud's original concept was that the analyst, through his neutral attitude, functions as a blank screen upon which the patient casts his emotional reactions; these reactions are characteristic for him, are determined exclusively by his past experiences, and are not influenced by the analyst's personality. In recent years, this concept has come to be considered an abstraction; there is now general agreement that it does not describe quite precisely phenomena actually occurring in the course of treatment. The relation between patient and therapist is a two-way street. The analyst, to whom the patient attributes the role of important persons of his past, nevertheless remains for the patient at the same time a real personality. There is no doubt that the analyst has an emotional reaction toward the patient which is determined by his own personality structure. This countertransference may not be openly expressed, yet it contributes to what I call the emotional climate of the interviews. These countertransference reactions become particularly marked after the patient's transference neurosis has fully developed. It is at this time that the analyst's own spontaneous emotional responses become most important.

Subtle Qualifications

Such psychoanalytic self-criticism, in this instance formulated after years of experimentation at the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis, inclines practitioners such as Dr. Alexander towards considerable humility in assessing the benefits accruing to patients during treatment. Neither the rather rigid Freudian formulation, nor any of its derivatives, in other words, can be depended upon to bring about entirely

predictable results. Always the "sense of fitness" and the emotional balance of the analyst become a part of the equation, and the minute affinities and antipathies between patient and analyst may either retard or advance therapy.

Dr. Alexander is also concerned with the cases of "interminable patients," those who, despite the presumably conscientious efforts of the practitioner, become dependent upon him. Such a patient, writes Dr. Alexander, "may go on in a fairly comfortable subjective state for years, provided he can see his analyst regularly. In such cases, a scrutiny of the nature of transference gratifications reveals that they consist primarily in the satisfaction of the patient's dependent needs."

A Perspective to be Shared

Freud was fully cognizant of the need for measuring the effectiveness of therapy by the degree to which the patient was finally set firmly on his own feet. But, according to Dr. Alexander, it is also mandatory for *the patient himself* to recognize this fact. His temporary dependence, serving as a therapeutic reassurance only at the outset, must soon be eliminated. Dr. Alexander writes:

> No matter how valuable and indispensable a factor it [dependence] may be, only by making it conscious and keeping it conscious can it serve an optimal value. This must be done by frustrating it, for interpretation alone does not always suffice. One of the most powerful frustrations consists in well-timed reduction of the frequency of the psychoanalytic interviews and well-timed shorter or longer interruptions. Routine continuation of the treatment in daily interviews over years may favor the regressive tendencies to such a degree that some patients will never be able to renounce them.

Psychotherapy and Priestcraft

Critics of psychoanalysis have often pointed to the resemblance between the analyst's couch and the confessor's booth. However, when men like Dr. Alexander themselves admit the dangerous similarity which may come to exist, they establish a significant distinction between priests and psychoanalysts. Priests have always regarded the dependence of the "believer" as an accomplishment, rather than as an obstacle to human growth, and when the father-confessor has induced members of his flock to "transfer" their psychic and moral problems to him—and thus cement that dependence—he is apt to feel that all is as it should be.

Dr. Alexander's article concludes with reflections which encourage analysts and psychiatrists to resist the thought that they can ever inevitably dispense perfect cures:

> Thus the medicine of artificial regression in the transference can be given in overdoses. Like radiation therapy, it is a powerful weapon, but not without danger, for it can become the source of a new illness. In order to improve the therapeutic procedure, we must become aware not only of its beneficial aspects but also of its hidden dangers. There is no use in denying that the history of psychoanalysis includes many interminable patients, along with its brilliant successes. But I believe that not all of these cases are incurable, and that we will be able to help many of them by learning how to handle, in terms of desirable quantities, the most effective factor of psychoanalytic therapy—the revival of the infantile neurotic conflicts in the transference situation.

Persistent Revaluation

> Many experienced analysts have expressed their reservations toward these quantitative variations of the so-called classical procedure and are inclined to consider them as dilutions of the classical procedure. Only time will decide the practical usefulness of these variations. One thing is certain: the mere repetition of routine—and the rejection of new suggestions as a threat to the purity of psychoanalysis—can lead only to stagnation. Further improvements of therapeutic technique can come only from a persistent re-examination of our theoretical premises and from relentless experimentation with technical modifications.

Dostoevsky Underground

Theosophists who may have wondered at H. P. Blavatsky's extreme praise of the writings of Feodor Dostoevsky will be interested in an article, "Dostoevsky's Underground Man," appearing in the Spring issue of *Antioch Review*. The author, Prof. N. B. Fagin, John Hopkins professor of English and drama, discusses the psychological reasons for the present suppression of Dostoevsky's works in Soviet Russia. The Soviets regard Dostoevsky, in one of their cultural spokesmen's own terms, as "a pernicious writer, dangerous for youth," and though the Russians have often displayed an almost hysterical pride in the accomplishments of fellow nationals, it is clear that they feel a matter of principle to be involved, and that they *must* disown the greatest Russian novelist of all time. Prof. Fagin, who spent several years in Russia

studying the theater, reports that it is virtually impossible today to obtain a single one of Dostoevsky's volumes in a Russian bookstore, nor are they available in the public libraries.

The Challenge of Philosophy

The implications which H.P.B. saw in *The Brothers Karamazov* are precisely the same as those sensed by present Russian cultural censors. At first glance, Dostoevsky may impress readers as simply a dark and brooding man, but underneath his exposure of what H.P.B. calls "the most unwelcome truths" lay his Promethean interpretation of the human soul as a being of potential power and greatness. One of the most disturbing authors who has even put pen to paper in any land, Dostoevsky first makes his readers uncomfortable, and then, by some astounding alchemy, is able to stimulate a strong desire in the reader for control of his own psychic life. H.P.B., at the conclusion of her article, "The Tidal Wave," reproduces an extensive quotation from one of Dostoevsky's appreciative critics, who wrote that he became the mouthpiece of the irrepressible, no longer to be delayed need felt by Society, to look with absolute sincerity into the innermost depths of its own soul, to become the impartial judge of its own actions and its own aspirations. The Dostoevskian ideal is a man who is able to stand outside of any partisanship or struggle for supremacy, and who "brings his past life as a guarantee of the sincerity and honesty of his vows and purposes."

Away With Complexity!

The good Communist, like the "good" political reactionary of other names and lands, does not like to be reminded that he *has* a psychological life, nor that there are ethical issues and moral decisions involved wherever he turns. He embraces a "dialectic"—a theory of progress which is both inflexible and which can be accepted as a matter of faith. Externalizing the realm of moral issues by projecting a few oversimplified moral platitudes upon the political screen, he is impatient of qualifications, paradoxes, and self-examination; in short, he becomes a chronic opponent of psychology.

Dostoevsky, whom H.P.B. calls a *born* Theosophist, saw that it was impossible for man to realize his higher destiny without casting off the yoke of external authority. As the *Antioch Review* article points out by quoting a Stalinist denunciation of Dostoevsky, the greatest Communist heresy is "the belief in the existence of an inner duality in man, an

eternal struggle going on within man." Dostoevsky, moreover, "believed evil to lie in the very nature of man and not in the way society was organized." As Professor Fagin puts it:

Freud Banned Too

> Mr. Byalik, voicing the present attitude of the Soviet cultural commissars towards Dostoevsky, evinces the same fear of a great writer whose works produce the dominant impressions that no amount of class consciousness or revolutionary zeal can effect a lasting change in a society so long as mankind—even the despised, perverse, contradictory individual man—remains morally inert.
>
> The fear is, of course, justified. But it is more than fear. Freud—who, like Dostoevsky, has lately been proscribed by the Communist ideologists—might detect in their proscriptions, omissions, and fulminations a profound sense of both insecurity and guilt. For commissars, too, are men, and possess secret selves, "internal enemies." One glimpse into their own depths, beneath the shallow optimism of their official social consciousness, and they are filled with mistrust of the masses upon whom they wish to impose the boon of Utopia. Perhaps, even so vaguely, they are even filled with mistrust of themselves. A joke current in the Soviet Union some years ago had Stalin standing before his mirror and studying his reflection. "One of us," he declared, "cannot be trusted. Is it you or I?" Dostoevsky would have appreciated the humor of the joke, but he would have also perceived the sadness of it; for, in its essence, it is a psychological metaphor which reveals the tragic dilemma of his underground man.

Dostoevsky Seldom Popular Anywhere

We recall one instance—tragic, ominous, or amusing, according to the way one views it—of a vigorous campaign launched in a prosperous American cultural community for the purpose of ousting a highschool principal. The principal, it was asserted, had "dangerously radical" ideas. He wished, for instance, to introduce some of those accursed "progressive theories" which people suspect of having a "pink" origin. Furthermore, proof positive of subversive notions, he had recommended inclusion of the works of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky in the libraries of the community! Apparently, the reasons which account for dislike of Dostoevsky in Russia have universal application, differing wherever "reactionism" exists only in the matter of degree, and unless this is realized the whole point of Prof. Fagin's article and of Dostoevsky's own writing will be nicely missed. Dostoevsky was brave enough, and persistent enough, to face the "uncomfortable."